

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed November 27, 2006, the Examiner noted that claims 1-37 were pending, and rejected claims 1-37. Claim 38 has been amended, no claims have been canceled, no new claims have been added and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-38 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 7-9 and 13-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Beasley, U.S. Patent No. 5,721,842 in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) and in further view of Nichols, U.S. Patent No. 7,039,810.

Beasley is directed to a computerized switching system for coupling a workstation to a remotely located computer. The Beasley system contains a crosspoint switch that allows input cards to transmits signals to and receives signals from up to eight of the remotely located server computers while, each of the output cards transmit to and receive signals from up to eight of the remotely located workstations Beasley Fig. 4, column 6 lines 14-20. The AAPA teaches a method that allows a user of a terminal to switch between a private computer and a network computer.

In the Office Action, on page 3, the Examiner states in the rejection of claim 1 that Beasley discloses: "*A connecting unit, i.e. switch 60, that connects each terminal to the **corresponding first computer in a default status**, and switches a connection destination of the terminal to the **at least one first computer** or the shared computer when a connection switching request is transmitted from the at least one terminal has been received (Fig 1, item 60 and col 2, lines 55-64)*". [Emphasis Added] But, claim 1 recites: "a connecting unit that connects each terminal to **a corresponding private computer in a default status**, and switches a connection destination of the terminal to the **at least one private computer corresponding to the at least one terminal** or the shared computer when a connection switching request transmitted from the at least one terminal has been received." [Emphasis Added] Nothing in Beasley as cited, teaches or suggests "a corresponding private computer in a **default status**," as in claim 1 or "a corresponding first computer in a **default status**," as in the Examiner's interpretation of claim 1 [Emphasis added]. Beasley teaches away from a first computer or a default status where it states: "up to thirty-two workstations can be connected to **any** of thirty-two remote computer systems." [Emphasis added] Column 2 lines 61-62.

Further, as Beasley teaches away from a corresponding first computer in a default status, there would be no motivation to combine the private computer of the AAPA with the switch of Beasley.

Additionally, the Examiner cites Beasley FIG. 2B, column 5, lines 39-52 and column 6 lines 11-29 and 43-57 as disclosing the “identification processing including utilizing an identifier corresponding to a connector through which a terminal is connected to encipher a received key code.” Nothing as cited teaches an encryption key corresponding to the connector. Beasley Fig. 2b does show a packet with a “destination address” and “sender address.” But nothing as cited, discloses that these are used as an encryption key.

Claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, 29 and 33 have been amended to recite “the identification processing enciphering a received key code.” Support for the amendment found in Figs. 1a and 1b of the application. The prior art failing to teach or suggest “the identification processing including utilizing an identifier corresponding to a connector through which the at least one terminal is connected, the identification processing enciphering a received key code,” as in claim 1.

For at least the reasons stated above, Beasley, AAPA and Nichols taken separately or in combination fail to teach or suggest the elements of claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 13, 17 and 21 and the claims dependent therefrom.

Claims 4, 10 and 25-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Beasley in view of AAPA, in further view of Nichols, in further view of Wilder, U.S. Patent No. 6,557,170. Wilder adds nothing to Beasley, AAPA and Nichols as regards the above discussed features. For at least the reasons stated above, Beasley, AAPA, Nichols and Wilder taken separately or in combination fail to teach or suggest the elements of claims 4, 10 and 25-28.

Claims 5-6, 11-12 and 29-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Beasley in view of AAPA, in further view of Nichols, in further view of Onsen, U.S. Patent No. 6,473,811. Onsen adds nothing to Beasley, AAPA and Nichols as regards the above discussed features. For at least the reasons stated above, Beasley, AAPA, Nichols and Onsen taken separately or in combination fail to teach or suggest the elements of claims 5-6, 11-12 and 29-36.

Claim 37 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Beasley in view of Nichols. The combination of Beasley and Nichols fails to teach or suggest “an identification processing unit coupled to the connection unit utilizing an identifier corresponding to a connector through which the terminal is connected to encipher a received code.”

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIM

Claim 38 is new. Support for claim 38 found on page 4 line 17 through page 6 line 14 of the application. The prior art failing to teach or suggest that at any one instance only one of the private computers can be connected to the network computer.

EXAMINER INTERVIEW

Applicants note that an in-person interview was conducted between the Examiner and Applicants' representative on February 23, 2007. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for his time. During the interview, proposed amendments to specify the identification processing enciphering a received key code were discussed. Further, Applicants' representative was notified that further search and consideration would be required if the proposed amendments were filed.

SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103. It is also submitted that claims 1-37 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: February 27, 2007

By: /James J. Livingston, Jr./
James J. Livingston, Jr.
Registration No. 55,394

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501